REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application. Claims 1-19 are pending in this application.

35 USC § 112

Claims 1 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Office Action states on Page 2, paragraph 2, "since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process the applicant is intending to encompass in order to add the index mark to each entry."

Applicant submits that amended claim 1 and amended claim 11 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112. Claim 1 recites several steps including "modifying the appearance of the printer menu hierarchy by adding an index mark to every Nth data entry in the level of data entries". Similarly, claim 11 recites several steps including "modifying the appearance of the data listing by adding an index mark to every Nth data entry in the data listing". Applicant submits that these claims clearly set forth the steps involved in the method/process. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections.

35 USC § 103

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-12, 14, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,836,565 to Nishikawa (hereinafter "Nishikawa").

Nishikawa discloses:

Conventionally, when a correction parameter is determined on the basis of the feature of an image obtained by analyzing image data, and the image is corrected, the processing speed becomes considerably low. In this invention, for an image file stored in an apparatus, reduced image data held in the file is analyzed to determine a correction parameter in printing, and the image is corrected on the basis of the correction parameter, thereby shortening the processing time. When an appropriate correction parameter is determined for an image file stored in the apparatus and added to the file in advance before printing, and the image is corrected on the basis of the correction parameter in printing, the processing time is further shortened. (Nishikawa Abstract).

Applicant submits that the Nishikawa reference, when combined with Applicant's admitted prior art, fails to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1.

Claim 1 of the present application, as amended, recites:

A method comprising:
identifying a printer menu hierarchy, wherein the printer menu hierarchy includes multiple levels of data entries;
analyzing each of the multiple levels of data entries to determine a number of data entries associated with each level; and
for each level of data entries having at least N data entries, modifying the appearance of the printer menu hierarchy by adding an index mark to every Nth data entry in the level of data entries.

Applicant's admitted prior art does not disclose or suggest "analyzing each of the multiple levels of data entries to determine a number of data entries

7   Application No. 10/053,157

associated with each level" and "for each level of data entries having at least N data entries, modifying the appearance of the printer menu hierarchy by adding an index mark to every Nth data entry in the level of data entries", as recited in claim 1. Further, the Nishikawa reference fails to disclose or suggest the above-cited elements of claim 1. Nishikawa makes no mention of determining a number of data entries associated with each of multiple levels. Nishikawa further makes no mention of modifying the appearance of the printer menu with an index mark on every Nth data entry. Although Fig. 13 of Nishikawa shows that the appearance of an icon changes when selected by a cursor, this activity is not the same as determining a number of data entries on a level and is not the same as adding an index mark on every Nth data entry.

Applicant further submits that the combination of Applicant's admitted prior art and Nishikawa fails to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1. The references, even when combined, lack any teaching or suggestion of the elements of claim 1 discussed above.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Nishikawa. Since claims 2-4, 6, and 8-10 depend from claim 1, they are likewise patentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Nishikawa.

Claim 11 of the present application, as amended, recites:

> A computer-implemented method comprising:
> identifying a data listing containing a plurality of data entries;
> analyzing the data listing to determine a number of data entries in the data listing; and
> if the data listing has at least N data entries, then modifying the appearance of the data listing by adding an index mark to every Nth data entry in the data listing.

8   Application No. 10/053,157

Applicant submits that Applicant's admitted prior art does not disclose or suggest "analyzing the data listing to determine a number of data entries in the data listing" and "if the data listing has at least N data entries, then modifying the appearance of the data listing by adding an index mark to every Nth data entry in the data listing", as recited in claim 11. Applicant further submits that the Nishikawa reference fails to disclose or suggest the above-cited elements of claim 11. Nishikawa makes no mention of determining a number of data entries in a data listing. Nishikawa further makes no mention of modifying the appearance of the data listing by adding an index mark to every Nth data entry. Although Fig. 13 of Nishikawa shows that the appearance of an icon changes when selected by a cursor, this activity is not the same as determining a number of data entries in a listing and is not the same as adding an index mark on every Nth data entry in that listing.

Applicant further submits that the combination of Applicant's admitted prior art and Nishikawa fails to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 11. The references, even when combined, lack any teaching or suggestion of the elements of claim 11 discussed above.

Accordingly, claim 11 is patentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Nishikawa. Since claims 12, 14, and 15 depend from claim 11, they are likewise patentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Nishikawa.

9   Application No. 10/053,157

Claims 5, 7, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Nishikawa, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,727,135 to Webb et al. (hereinafter "Webb").

Applicant submits that the Webb reference fails to remedy the deficiencies of Applicant's admitted prior art and Nishikawa as discussed above with respect to claim 1 and claim 11. Webb makes no reference to analyzing a data listing or modifying the appearance of the listing as recited in claims 1 and 11.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 5 and 7 (which depend from claim 1) and claim 13 (which depends from claim 11) are patentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Nishikawa, and further in view of Webb.

Claims 16-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,058,277 to Streefkerk et al. (hereinafter "Streefkerk") in view of Applicant's admitted prior art and further in view of Nishikawa.

Claim 16 of the present application recites:

> A printer comprising:
> a processor configured to communicate with a storage device in the printer and to communicate with other devices coupled to the printer; and
> a storage device coupled to the processor, the storage device containing a printer menu hierarchy associated with the printer, and wherein the printer menu hierarchy includes a plurality of data entries and an index mark associated with every Nth data entry in the plurality of data entries.

10   Application No. 10/053,157

Applicant submits that the Streefkerk reference fails to remedy the deficiencies of Applicant's admitted prior art and Nishikawa as discussed above with respect to claim 1 and claim 11. In particular, Streefkerk makes no reference to a printer menu hierarchy that includes multiple data entries and "an index mark associated with every Nth data entry in the plurality of data entries", as recited in claim 16. Thus, the combination of Applicant's admitted prior art, Nishikawa, and Streefkerk fails to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 16.

Accordingly, claim 16 is patentable over Streefkerk in view of Applicant's admitted prior art and further in view of Nishikawa. Since claims 17-19 depend from claim 16, they are likewise patentable over Streefkerk in view of Applicant's admitted prior art and further in view of Nishikawa.

Conclusion

Claims 1-19 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: __/-26-06__   By: _____
                                Steven R. Sponseller
                                Reg. No. 39,384
                                (509) 324-9256 ext. 250